



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/944,234	10/06/97	VINCENT	B P1178USA

TODD S PARKHURST
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS
321 NORTH CLARK
SUITE 3300
CHICAGO IL 60610

QM31/0402

EXAMINER

TUCKER, G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3731

DATE MAILED:

04/02/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/944,234

Applicant(s)
Vincent et al.

Examiner
Guy V. Tucker

Group Art Unit
3309



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 16-18 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 5-15 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit 3309

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(B) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Noiles (4,662,891). Noiles discloses a concave form cutter (10). Note that Noiles mills in directions transverse to the longitudinal axis of the device. Note that the intended use of the claimed device has been considered but does not serve to structurally distinguish the claim over the applied reference.

Claims 1, 5-7, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Frigg et al (5,041,119). Frigg et al discloses a form cutter (1) a drive means (7) and a housing (4). Note that the intended use of the claimed device has been considered but does not serve to structurally distinguish the claim over the applied reference.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(A) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noiles. Noiles discloses the invention as potentially claimed as discussed above. However, Noiles does not

Art Unit 3309

disclose that the device is 9 mm or smaller. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Noiles device smaller in order to be able to use the device on very small animals.

Claims 8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frigg et al. Frigg et al discloses the invention substantially as claimed as discussed above. However, Frigg et al does not disclose the mechanical expedient of a belt drive. It is well known to drive rotary devices with a belt. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of this well known use, to drive the device of Frigg et al with a belt.

Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 16-18 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Guy Tucker at telephone number (703) 308-3271. Examiner Tucker can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM, Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, examiner Tucker's

Serial No. 08/944,234

-4-

Art Unit 3309

supervisor, Michael Buiz, can be reached at (703) 308-0871. The fax number for Group 3300 is (703) 305-3590 or 3591.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 3300 receptionist at (703) 308-0858.

GVT

March 22, 1998

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Guy V. Tucker".

GUY V. TUCKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3300